

Appln. No. 10/019,992

Attorney Docket No. 10541-929

## **II. Remarks**

Reconsideration and reexamination of this application is herein requested. Claims 19-32 remain pending in the application.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

In the Final Office Action mailed March 8, 2006, Claims 25-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Specifically, the last line of claim 19 has been amended to change "mans" to "means". Also, in line 7 of claim 25, the phrase "permitting the production of said first side" is has been deleted. Accordingly, it is believed that this rejection is now moot and should be withdrawn.

### **Further Claim Clarifications**

Prior to discussing the reference, it is believed that a brief discussion on the current form of the independent claims of this application is warranted. Claims 19 and 25 have been amended to clarify, more particularly point out and distinctly claim that which the Applicants regard as the subject matter of the present invention. Specifically, these claims now recite that the cutting of the second cutting means overlaps a portion of the first straight side extending tangentially to the apex and being formed by the first cutting means.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 25-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,729,273 issued to Fazis (Fazis).

The Examiner has stated that the blades shown in Fazis do not make overlapping cuts. Claim 25 has been amended to specifically recite that the cutting by the second cutting means overlaps the cutting formed by the first cutting means.

Since Fazis does not disclose making overlapping cuts, this rejection should be withdrawn.

BRINKS  
HOTER  
GILSON  
ALONE

Appln. No. 10/019,992

Attorney Docket No. 10541-929

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 19-22, 25-28, 31 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bitzel. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 19, 25 and 31 of the present application each specifically recite that a first cutting means is used to simultaneously produce an apex and a portion of a first straight side extending generally tangentially from the apex. Bitzel fails to disclose this step. The cutting side S1 in Bitzel is arcuate along its entire length and therefore cannot physically be used to produce an portion of a first straight side. Accordingly, Bitzel cannot suggest forming a straight side simultaneously with the apex and thereafter performing an overlapping cut of the previously formed straight side, as claimed, to finish forming the first straight side. Similarly, Fazis also fails to disclose or suggest such a procedure.

SUMMARY

In view of the above remarks, it is submitted that pending claims 19-32 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner grant allowance of these claims. If such communication would expedite this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned via telephone.

June 8, 2006

Date

Respectfully submitted,

  
Eric D. Sosenko (Reg. No. 34,440)

BRINKS  
HOFER  
GILSON  
OLIGNE